

REMARKS/ARGUMENT

Claims 1-31 are indicated as containing allowable subject matter. The application is in condition for allowance except for the formal matters identified by the Examiner.

Applicants amended the claims in conformance with the Examiner's recommendations except for the follow:

Office Action page 2, lines 16-17: The Examiner recommended that "said plurality of outputs" in line 12 should be replaced by --each of said plurality of outputs--. Claim 1, line 12 does not contain any such limitation. Applicants believe the Examiner meant to state: "said plurality of digital-to-analog converters" in line 12 should be replaced by --each of said plurality of digital-to-analog converters--. Applicants amended line 12 in accordance with this understanding.

Office Action page 2, lines 19-20: The Examiner recommended replacing "delayed with" with the term --delayed in phase with-- in Claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's added terminology is inappropriate. A time period is "time", hence the correct phrase is --delayed in time--, and Applicants have so amended Claim 1.

Office Action page 3, lines 5: Applicants believe the Examiner meant to state claim "15" NOT "8". Applicants amended Claim 15 in accordance with this understanding.

Office Action page 3, line 10: The Examiner recommended replacing "delayed with" with the term --delayed in phase with-- in Claim 15. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's added terminology is inappropriate. A time period is "time", hence the correct phrase is --delayed in time--, and Applicants have so amended Claim 15.


Office Action page 3, lines 15-16: Applicants do not understand the Examiner's determination that "in line 3, "coupled to DSP" should be replaced by --coupled to said DSP--, since there is only one DSP recited in Claim 21. Applicants took no action on this request.

Office Action page 4, lines 3-4: The Examiner recommended replacing "delayed with" with the term --delayed in phase with-- in Claim 29. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's added terminology is inappropriate. A time period is "time", hence the correct phrase is --delayed in time--, and Applicants have so amended Claim 29.

Office Action page 4, lines 6-8: The Examiner recommended replacing "delayed with" with the term --delayed in phase with-- in Claims 30 and 31. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's added terminology is inappropriate. A time period is "time", hence the correct phrase is --delayed in time--, and Applicants have so amended Claims 30 and 31.

Claims 1-31 stand allowable. Applicants respectfully request allowance of the application as the earliest possible date.

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald O. Neerings
Reg. No. 34,227
Attorney for Applicants

TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED
P.O. BOX 655474, M/S 3999
Dallas, Texas 75265
Phone: 972/917-5299
Fax: 972/917-4418